

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**November 1, 2012**

**PRESENT;** Members Richard Householder, Jan MacKinnon and Lowrie Sargent; Alternate Member Sid Lindsley; Don White, Select Board Liaison to the Planning Board; and CEO Steve Wilson

**ABSENT:** Member Kerry Sabanty

The meeting of the Planning Board of November 1, 2012 was convened at 5:00 pm by the Chair.

**1. PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**

Kristi Bifulco: Ms. Bifulco is back before the Board to request that they consider her zoning amendment proposal for the Warrant next June. She did not realize that the issue was on the Discussion List portion of the agenda, and she will wait until then and be available in case there are any questions the Board might have.

Ms. MacKinnon reminded everyone to vote on Tuesday, especially for the two articles on the Warrant to amend the Zoning Ordinance: Article VI and XI.

**2. MINUTES**

Minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting

**3. APPROVAL OF 2<sup>ND</sup> DONATED DOWNTOWN BUSINESS DIRECTIONAL SIGN**

Businesses at the old Knox Mill have come forward with a proposal for a sign to direct visitors to the shops and restaurants in the River Business District. The Board had Tabled a vote on the sign proposal wanting to see the changes proposed by sign-maker Joe Ryan first.

Mr. Ryan had proposed a way finding map for the back side of the sign. The CEO had taken this proposal to CEDAC and to the Development Director for comments, and heard concerns that this design may cause confusion when put alongside a future way-finding signage package that is part of the Downtown Plan that might be implemented in the near future; they were hoping that what goes on the back of the sign could wait until the entire way-finding package is fleshed out.

Mr. Sargent noted that he is on CEDAC and they have not discussed this issue. Mr. Wilson replied that it had not been before the entire Board, but that the Development Director, Brian Hodges, had talked to a couple of people, and shown the proposed design with a map on it to them and to the Town Manager. Mr. Sargent doesn't think that doing something with the back side of the sign needs to wait; it will be a vinyl sheet that can be removed at any time and replaced with whatever design is chosen. That may be a ways down the road, however, because the CEDAC group is just beginning to set priorities, and those signs, while initially high on the list, may not be finalized for a while.

Last meeting the Board Tabled a Motion to approve a design for the back side of the sign that would be similar to other directional signs with an arrow pointing ahead and the words "Downtown Business District" and "Harbor" as long as the front side of the sign matches exactly the sign color and configuration as the signs on Bayview Street. That Motion is back on the floor for a vote:

**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** to approve a design for the back side of the sign with an arrow and the words "Downtown Business District" and "Harbor" with the condition that the front side of the sign matches exactly the sign color and configuration as the signs on Bayview Street.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

## **6. DISCUSSION:**

1. *Minor field adjustments:* There were none

2. *Future Agenda items:*

Proposed Ordinance Amendments:

Zoning:

Items 1 and 2 involve parking issues: Those two items should be grouped together, along with seasonal parking, and held for future discussion.

Property maintenance for abandoned/neglected properties failed, after a lengthy discussion, to gain a majority of the Board who wanted to see the item on the "June List". The discussion centered around where to draw the line between a property that had been neglected or abandoned, and a property owner who just didn't want to, or couldn't, keep their property up to that standard. While the safety hazard issue that such a neglected property might raise is a very difficult one for the Code Enforcement Officer to address, concerns over property rights and the difficulty in finding a subjective standard for enforcement resulted in finding that there were 3 members who did not wish to work on this issue at this time, and only 2 who did. Absent any written policy with regard to adding items to the June List, the Chair stated that a majority sentiment would suffice as a way to decide. The item will remain on the Possible List.

√ Storage trailer and vault boxes regulation will be the #1 priority for next June

The CEO has added a new item #6 to the Zoning Amendments: Exterior Lighting: He hears from many that the ordinance is confusing, and there are many violations where there are tall posts with glaring lights at the street. The regulations are not clear about light going off property or being shielded.

Ms. MacKinnon thinks that the Town's street lamps are not shielded and the lights are terribly bright. While members agree that controlling exterior lighting has never been done with regard to residential uses, it can be done through Site Plan. Mr. Sargent noted however, changes can only be made going forward, so some of the more troublesome lighting – like the Towns' street lamps – would not be addressed by any change; it would be difficult to find an effective solution. The Board agreed to keep that item on their "Possible" list.

Research Open Space Commercial Zone for Sagamore Farm: Others agreed with Mr. Sargent that the Board should look to addressing this issue in the Comp Plan re-write, and Mr. MacLean suggested that use of the park might be included as a future “Business Plan” for the Town is developed.

Subdivision:

- √ The Plan recording deadline needs to be changed to comply with State guidelines.  
The remainder of the issues all concern joint review and that does not seem to be a pressing issue at this time; the item will remain on the List.
- √ Plan recording deadline for subdivisions will be added under “Housekeeping” on the June list.
- √ The two requested zone changes – Ann Keefe and the Bifulcos – have been before the Board long enough and a decision should be made; both will be added to the June List.

Neither of the Gateway 1 amendments appeared pressing to the Board but they will stay on the list.

There are two housekeeping amendments that the CEO thinks are important to include at this time:

- The first is the Commercial Parking v. “utility” issue: He believes that there is a hole in the
- √ Ordinance as written that allows existing buildings to be demolished for parking. If it is the intent of the Ordinance to prevent the demolition of buildings, the wording needs to be changed.
- √ The second issue is to change the Site Plan timelines so they agree with possible meeting schedules without putting the Applicant at risk of non-compliance.

At this point in time the Board has five amendments pending for June; additional housekeeping items may be added, although the CEO is concerned that at some point the number of amendments being put forward reaches the voters “saturation point”, and that all amendments can suffer failure at the polls if that happens.

### *3. Pending Applications:*

Application for Site Plan Review: A new business on Mt. Battie Street with a business below and a residence above as required in this district: proposed for hearing next meeting.

Revision to an Approved Subdivision: A subdivision approved in 1988 is back to move the existing right-of-way and relocate a drive way: proposed for review next meeting.

Update on possible Site Plan Review – Norwood Avenue: This building will only be used to store lobster gear and equipment, and that falls under an accessory to a residential use and does not require review even though it will be a 40' x 40' building.

Request to abandon an approved subdivision – possibly to be heard next meeting.

There being no further business before the Planning Board they adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary